

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application. Claims 1-6, 9-17, 22 and 24-26 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 11-12, 14, 16 and 22 have been amended to clarify the currently claimed invention. Support can be found in, for example, paragraphs [0006], [0019], [0024] and [0032] of Applicants' Specification as filed. No new matter has been added.

**Examiner Interview Summary**

A telephonic interview was conducted between the Examiner and Applicants' counsel on February 5, 2008. Independent claim 1 with a proposed amendment, which is substantially reflected in the above claim amendment, was discussed along with the newly cited reference, Kumar Malavalli et al., "Fibre Channel Generic Services-3 (FC-GS-3)," NCITS working draft proposed American National Standard for Information Technology, January 13, 2000 ("Malavalli," newly cited). A specific agreement was not reached on patentability of claim 1 as proposed.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 6, 11, 14, 16 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Malavalli in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,362,717 of Betker ("Betker," previously cited).

**Claims 1 and 6**

Claim 1, as amended, recites "*assigning a common name to a pair of ports*

*without assigning an IP address to each of the pair of ports, wherein the common name is assigned to each port of the pair of ports, each port in the pair of ports is located on first and second FC node devices, respectively, and the pair of ports includes a source port and a destination port ...."* As such, in claim 1, to establish a link between a source port and a destination port, the same name is assigned to two different ports, *i.e.*, the source and destination ports.

Malavalli is one version of the FC standards. As an FC component defined in the FC standards, the FC name server provides a way for a port to register and discover a symbolic name. In particular, Malavalli discloses the RSPN\_ID request, which is a command used to store a symbolic name for a port in the FC name server.

However, a command used to store a symbolic name for a port does not teach or suggest assigning the same (*i.e.*, common) name to two different ports as recited in claim 1. Indeed, no part of Malavalli teaches or suggests *assigning a common name to a source port and a destination port, and establishing a link between the source port and the destination port based on the common name* as claimed by Applicants, much less "... without assigning an IP address to each of the pair of ports ...."

Accordingly, Malavalli cannot teach or suggest "storing the common name-to-port assignment within a name server for the FC fabric," as recited in claim 1. Likewise, Malavalli cannot teach or suggest "configuring the first FC node device to query the name server to obtain an FC address identifier for the port located on the second FC

node device *based on the common name, and* configuring the second FC node device to query the name server to obtain an FC address identifier ... *based on the common name,* " as recited in claim 1.

Betker does not make up for the deficiencies in Malavalli. Considering that the FC standards do not provide a mechanism to combine multiple switch modules into one single switch, Betker proposes a multi-module fibre channel *switch* equipped with a dynamic assignment functionality of the domain IDs. The part cited in the Office Action merely provides general information about an FC network system based on a switched fabric topology in conjunction with Figure 1, general configuration information about fabric switches in conjunction with Figure 2, and configuration information about the multi-module fibre channel switch in conjunction with Figure 3, which Betker proposes. No part of Betker teaches or suggests assigning the same (*i.e.*, common) name to two ports, *i.e.*, a source port and a destination port, and establishing a link between the source port and the destination port based on the common name as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because a combination of Malavalli and Betker does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 1, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Malavalli and Betker.

Claim 6 contains similar limitations as the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, at least for the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Malavalli and Betker.

Claims 2-5 and 8-10 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 6, respectively and thus, include the limitations set forth in their respective base claim. Therefore, at least for the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-5 and 8-10 are allowable.

Claims 11, 14 and 16

Claim 11, as amended, recites “querying a name server for the FC fabric to obtain a FC address identifier for the second port, *based on a match of a symbolic name of the first FC port and a symbolic name of the second FC port, without using an IP address assigned to the second FC port, wherein the match occurs when the symbolic name of the first FC port is equal to the symbolic name of the second FC port ....*”

As discussed above, because Malavalli does not teach or suggest storing the same (*i.e.*, common) name in an FC name server as the symbolic names of two different FC ports, Malavalli cannot teach or suggest querying an FC name server to find a match of the symbolic names of two different ports, where the match occurs when the two symbolic names are equal to each other as recited in claim 11.

Furthermore, Betker does not teach or suggest such a querying operation as claimed in claim 11. The multi-module Fibre Channel switch of Betker uses multiple

blades as shown in Figure 2. However, neither the multi-module FC *switch* nor each *blade* as disclosed in Betker can be properly interpreted as an FC *port* of a FC node device in an fabric as claimed.

Thus, a combination of Malavalli and Betker does not teach or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed in claim 11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Malavalli and Betker.

Claims 14 and 16 contain similar limitations as the limitations of claim 11. Therefore, at least for the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Malavalli and Betker.

Claims 12-13, 15 and 17 depend from claims 11, 14 and 16, respectively and thus, include the limitations set forth in their respective base claim. Therefore, at least for the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-13, 15 and 17 are allowable.

#### Claim 22

Claim 22, as amended, recites "searching the plurality of values received from the name server *to find a match with a version number and a combination of a plurality of attributes of the second FC node device,*" "... wherein the plurality of attributes are selected from the group consisting of a port type, a slot number and a sub-slot number

for each port in the second FC node device," "the version number identifies an encoding process used to encode the combination of the plurality of attributes," and "the match occurs when the version number and the combination of the plurality of attributes of the second FC node device are found from the received plurality of values."

No part of Malavalli discloses or suggests storing *a version number and a combination of attributes including a port type, a slot number and a sub-slot number*, where *the version number* identifies an encoding process used to encode the combination *as a symbolic name* for an FC port in an FC name server. As a result, Malavalli cannot teach or suggest searching values of a symbolic name field in an FC name server to find a match with the version number and the combination of attributes for an FC port as required by claim 22.

Furthermore, Betker does not teach or suggest such a searching operation as claimed in claim 22 because Betker does not teach or suggest storing such a version number and a combination of attributes as claimed in claim 22 as a symbolic name of an FC port. Thus, a combination of Malavalli and Betker does not teach or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed in claim 22. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Malavalli and Betker.

Claims 23-25 depend from claim 22. Therefore, at least for the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 23-25 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Any necessary extension of time for response not already requested is hereby requested. Please charge any corresponding fee to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: February 17, 2009



Kerry S. Liang  
Reg. No. 60,519

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, California 94805-4040  
(408) 720-8300